

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VI, NO. 6

FEBRUARY 10, 1958



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

Senator Humphrey Provides A New Voice for Peace

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey performed a great public service in the Senate last week. He sketched out for the first time what could be an alternative opposition foreign policy for the Democrats. Where others have merely criticized the rigidity of Mr. Dulles or spoken in generalities of the need to search for peace, Senator Humphrey outlined the essential elements of a flexible foreign policy, covering disarmament and every major area of the world from China to Latin America. His speech was in striking contrast to the barren and evasive statement issued by the Democratic Advisory Council a few days earlier, a statement which reflected the stalemate within the Council between former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, who does not differ in essentials from Mr. Dulles, and those members of the Council like Senator Humphrey, Governor Williams of Michigan and former Senator Lehman who want the Democrats to strike out on an independent line of their own. The Humphrey speech at last gave full expression to those elements and new hope to those who have long looked for a major spokesman in the cause of peace.

Lyndon Johnson Backs Him

The biggest news in the speech itself was its advocacy of a separate agreement to suspend nuclear testing. The biggest news in its presentation was the friendly send-off given the speech by Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson, who said Humphrey had "never rendered a greater service." This gave the speech the impact of something more than a personal effort, though much less of course than the expression of accepted party policy. During the course of the afternoon during which Humphrey spoke, Clark of Pennsylvania said he wished there was some way to convince the whole world "that the one thing the American people, from the most humble citizen to the President of the United States, desire more than anything else in the world is peace." It is a good thing the Humphrey address was not televised all over the world or it would have made millions feel there is hardly any subject in which the Senate of the United States is less interested.

Here was the chairman of the Senate's disarmament subcommittee in a major speech which contained serious criticism of the President and Secretary of State and proposed a new approach to the bogged down arms talks. Yet the Republicans, from the Vice President down, chose to treat it as a social error, administering the cold snub of empty benches. Except for Javits of New York, who courageously broke party lines to come in and praise Humphrey's effort, the Republicans stayed away all through the four hours in which Humphrey held the floor. All that time only one Republican was present, at one time Curtis, at another Cot-

Krushchev on Atom Test Inspection

"I asked him [Krushchev] at this point whether he agreed with Western statesmen who said that nuclear bombs could now be exploded without the risk of detection from afar and that therefore controls would be necessary if it could be agreed to suspend bomb tests for a while.

"I believe," he said, 'that it is impossible to let off bombs without their being detected. An explosion can always be detected. I don't mean only through earth tremors; a country might say that a shock of that kind was natural in cause. But, as the earth revolves, all countries can take samples of the air over them. When we exploded our first hydrogen bomb the Americans knew it was a hydrogen bomb and not another atomic explosion. Talk of a clean bomb is pure charlatanry.'

"But Russia was still ready to have control posts in her territory; that should take the ground from under the feet of those who said that Russia wanted to let off bombs in secret."

—Interview with Krushchev, *London Times*, Feb. 1.

ton, then Javits, to hold down the minority leader's seat. It was most disappointing that Flanders of Vermont and Cooper of Kentucky, though interested in disarmament, lacked the spirit to join Javits in welcoming the Humphrey discussion.

More Soliloquy Than Debate

There were times during the afternoon when Humphrey seemed to be engaged in a full dress soliloquy on foreign policy, when there was no one else in the chamber but himself and that lone Republican. There were never more than a dozen Democrats on the floor and rarely that many. But during the afternoon seventeen showed up to give Humphrey a breathing spell and some moral support. The names of those to whom he thus "yielded" in the old fashioned ballet of Senatorial procedure deserve to be recorded. They were, in addition to Johnson, Church (Idaho), Monroney (Okla.), Anderson (N. M.), Mansfield (Mont.), Clark (Pa.), Ellender (La.), Symington (Mo.), Kefauver (Tenn.), Douglas (Ill.), Jackson (Wash.), Carroll (Col.), Morse (Ore.), Sparkman (Ala.), Fulbright (Ark.) and Long (La.). The conservative troglodytes of the party in the South like Russell and Byrd conspicuously stayed away. Among the liberal Democrats who failed to give Humphrey a hand were Neuberger (Ore.), Green (R. I.), McNamara (Mich.), Hennings (Mo.), Hill (Ala.), Kennedy (Mass.), Magnuson (Wash.), Murray (Mont.), O'Mahoney (Wyo.), Proxmire (Wis.) and Pastore (R. I.). They ought to hear from home.

We suggest that peace groups all over the country obtain

(Continued on Page Two)

Humphrey Wants to End The Little Arms Races in Mid-East and Korea

(Continued from Page One)

the February 4 Congressional Record, study the Humphrey speech, ask their Senators and Congressmen how they stand on its proposals and call public meetings to discuss them. The junior Senator from Minnesota has given the peace movement a chance to emerge from its isolated corner into the major field of party politics. Senator Humphrey (see box below) satirized the incomprehensibly complex way the Administration has tangled a supposed "first step" disarmament program into nine interlocked proposals of an almost utopian perfectionism. His first proposal is to break the package down so it can be understood and negotiated. His second is to negotiate an end to nuclear testing with inspection. His third in effect is for a joint study by American and Soviet scientists of the two different though related problems of inspection (1) how to police an end of weapons tests and (2) how to cut off manufacture of fissionable materials for weapons purposes altogether. In this connection there ought to be organized public pressure for the release of the task force reports on inspection and control which Stassen initiated and which Humphrey says Dulles first promised and then denied his subcommittee. Since inspection is the main stumbling block on both sides, it would be useful to have a good look at just how extensive it would need to be. The unwillingness to release the reports will make some people suspect that the difficulties are not as great as they are supposed to be, otherwise the State Department would be anxious to release them.

Arms Control in Other Areas

Senator Humphrey again praised George Kennan's initiative in opening fresh discussion of the German problem. (The absence of any reference to Germany in the Democratic Advisory statement indicates that Mr. Acheson was unable to persuade his colleagues to join him in criticism of Kennan). Without endorsing Kennan's specific proposals, Humphrey suggested ways in which negotiation might be made more flexible and some form of mutual withdrawal negotiated.

Two Basic Delusions of U.S. Policy

"There is reason to believe that those who conduct and design foreign policy make two false assumptions regarding the Soviet Union.

"The first is that the United States has such political, military and economic superiority that it can force the U. S. S. R. to accept our terms in any series of negotiations.

"The other assumption is that the internal domestic difficulties of the Soviet regime are so great that all we need to do is continue to apply pressure and the collapse of the system will follow. Both of these assumptions have been stated or implied many times. Recent events have shattered the validity of these assumptions."

—Humphrey on Disarmament, U.S. Senate, Feb. 4.

In the Middle East, Humphrey saw the Eisenhower Doctrine reduced to a "shambles" and advocated an international arms embargo on shipments to that highly inflammable area. He proposed a UN Special Commission on Arms Traffic to take responsibility and to make the area a pilot project in both ground and aerial inspection. He also suggested U. S. initiative in the UN for the establishment of a Middle East Development Authority which might create conditions in which the key problems of Arab refugees and Arab-Israeli peace might at last be solved.

Where Mr. Dulles's universal panacea is to initiate regional arms races, Senator Humphrey proposes instead to negotiate their end. He wants arms limits negotiated in the danger areas of the Far East, particularly Korea and he touched on the folly of discussing world arms limitations without bringing in Communist China. He applied the same general views to an area outside the cold war, Latin America, suggesting that there, too, it would be desirable if our aid programs could be "geared primarily to developing Latin American economies and raising living standards." This speech offered fresh approach and can open a fruitful national debate if there is a response from the country.

Who Ever Heard of A "First Step" Containing Nine Points?

"Our present disarmament proposals consist of the following points: (1) prevention of surprise attack through aerial and ground inspection, (2) suspension of nuclear weapons tests, (3) prohibition of fissionable material production for weapons purposes, (4) a beginning on the transfer of fissionable material from weapons to peaceful purposes, (5) modest reduction of armed forces, (6) the transfer of selected armaments to international depots, (7) the prohibition of the transfer of nuclear weapons to other countries, (8) the establishment of a committee to study ways to insure that objects sent into outer space will be used exclusively for peaceful and scientific purposes, and (9) the grant of authority to an international agency to study the control of the export and importation of armaments.

"The United States refers to these nine points as constituting a first-step disarmament treaty. I submit that these points amount to much more than a first step. What would be left for a second, third or fourth step agreement would be rather insignificant compared to the disarming that would have been undertaken in this so-called first step. To call these nine steps a 'start' on world disarmament is inaccurate and unrealistic.

"No nation, least of all the suspicious, tightly controlled Soviet Union would agree to such sweeping provisions all at one time. The most important points in the U. S. disarmament proposals require the installation of elaborate inspection systems. Do we really expect the Soviet Union to open up its country to the extent of foreign inspectors in all atomic energy plants, all test sites, all major communication centers, all ports, all airfields, all depots to mention only the most important inspection points in our proposals? And would we be ready to reciprocate if the Soviet Union were to surprise us by accepting the proposal?

"What seems necessary at this point if we are ever to reach a real and genuine first step agreement with the Soviet Union is to be willing to break up the disarmament package. We should be prepared to negotiate on each of these nine points separately. . . . I must emphasize here that it is utopian to expect to reach comprehensive agreements with the Soviet Union on any matter. To think we can obtain them on the most sensitive aspects of their and our national security is deceiving the American people as well as the entire world."

—Humphrey on Disarmament, U.S. Senate, Feb. 4.

In the Senate, Hennings Given \$115,000 to Protect Constitutional Liberties

House Un-American Gets Another \$305,000, With Only One Dissenter

Those who picture the Supreme Court's shift to liberalism under Warren as a mechanical reaction to a change in public temper, discounting the influence of the Chief Justice and an influential few like him with courage and vision, should study the "debate" in the House of Representatives on January 30 when the Un-American Activities Committee was given another \$305,000. If the shift on the Court was a mere reflection of a shift in public opinion, the House would show a change, too. But it didn't.

Despite the Watkins decision, and the presence in the House of a considerable number of thoughtful liberals and able constitutional lawyers, the new appropriation and the old enabling resolution were approved without discussion in a voice vote with a thin scattering of unidentifiable "nays."

One Brave Man

Only one member, Roy W. Wier (*D. Minn.*) stood up and asked that he be recorded against the Committee. Our hat is off to him. Albert P. Morano (*R. Conn.*) then made a feeble little speech in favor of the Committee and the new appropriation was railroaded through. Thereupon Committee members, apparently afraid to speak up on the floor, proceeded to unload the kind of poisonous slander and reckless inaccuracy typical of the Committee in speeches added as "extensions of remarks."

Here are a few samples. That clown, Gordon H. Scherer (*R. Ohio*) spoke of "the hard core of the Communist conspiracy" as "the ADA, the Communist-dominated Emergency Civil Liberties Committee and the *Washington Post*." Pat Kearney (*D. N. Y.*) linked the ECLC with a Committee witness named Hugh Hardyman who was accused of making germ warfare charges in speeches behind the Iron Curtain. Kearney said Hardyman was a member of the ECLC. He is not. Clyde Doyle (*D. Cal.*) tried to explain away the anti-

Memo for Soviet Readers

We regard the attack on Howard Fast in *Literaturnaya Gazeta* as exactly the kind of literary hooliganism which disgraced the Stalin epoch; critics were never answered but only defamed. This kind of international boorishness is in poor accord with the campaign for peaceful co-existence and the charge of Zionism against Fast is a cover-up for the Soviet regime's consistent failure (which he protested) to make public amends for the savage liquidation of Yiddish writers and literature in the Soviet Union during Stalin's final years. News of this was allowed to leak out through an obscure Polish Jewish Communist paper but has never been given corrective publicity in the USSR itself.

House Committee resolution passed by the State Convention of the California Democratic Council in Fresno last month. He did not, of course, put the actual text of the Council Resolution in the record.

Powell's Position

The only other extension of remarks was by Clayton Powell (*D. N. Y.*) who thought the Committee had done "a laudable job in quarantining Communists" but criticized it for not going after the Klan.

The day before, in the Senate, Hennings of Missouri was given another \$115,000 for the Constitutional Rights subcommittee of Senate Judiciary, with the approval of its chairman, Eastland. The only subject Hennings indicated his rather moribund subcommittee was preparing to work on was legislation having to do with freedom of information in the executive branch. The only work he boasted of was sending an observer to the Girard trial. From all indications the Hennings subcommittee is set on a course which will not annoy Eastland.

New Protection for Non-Conformists Foreshadowed in Sacher Case Dissent

For no court in the country was the Watkins decision a more bitter pill than the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. Ever since the cases of the Hollywood Ten and of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, its rulings had given the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee a free hand. In the absence of review by the Supreme Court for almost a decade, the rulings of Judge Prettyman on the Court of Appeals were the law until overruled by Watkins. In the new 5-4 Sacher decision, as in the Barenblatt decision, that same court is trying hard to rationalize the Watkins decision out of existence. We believe it will fail.

Harry Sacher, as counsel for the second echelon Smith Act cases in New York, was one of the victims of the attempt by the Senate Internal Security subcommittee to punish those involved in the recantation of Harvey Matusow and to create an intimidating atmosphere around the efforts to obtain new trials on the basis of that recantation. He answered freely all questions bearing on a supposed conspiracy to bring about the recantation but declined on grounds of conscience (not the Fifth) to answer questions about his own political associations.

The general authorization of the Senate committee in the field of "internal security" is as vague and broad as that of the House committee over "un-American activities" and

wide enough for any kind of inquisition.

What happens when such an inquiry enters the field of First Amendment rights? Judge Fahy for the minority quoted two Supreme Court decisions. One was the *Rumely* case where the Court held that where a First Amendment question is involved, the courts must "construe narrowly the resolution describing the committee's authority." The other was the Watkins decision which said "when First Amendment rights are threatened, the delegation of power to the committee must be clearly revealed in its charter."

New principles were also foreshadowed by the Fahy dissent when it said (1) that in the area of First Amendment rights, courts should be slow to compel testimony by a witness against himself even if he does not wish to invoke the Fifth and (2) "Individual values sought to be protected by the Bill of Rights should cause the courts not to coerce unnecessarily by the penalty of the criminal law answers which might publicly convict the witness of unfaithfulness to a standard of good citizenship held by all but a few of his fellow citizens." This recalls the earlier law in England which held that the privilege might be invoked not only against self-incrimination but also against testimony which might tend to defame or degrade. This strikes directly at the use of Congressional committees as a kind of public pillory to expose holders of non-conformist views.

Calls Negotiations to End Threat of War Urgent in Interview With Chicago Tribune

Gen. Bradley Denies Pacifism But Warns Against Electronic Arms Race

(Chicago Tribune Press Service)

"Wash. Jan. 30—Omar N. Bradley said recently a space age H-bomb war would not be over in a few hours but might drag on for many years without a decision.

"Bradley, one of the nation's military elder statesmen of five-star rank, said that so long as the U. S. keeps up its strength 'approximately equal to that of Russia' we could not be defeated quickly. He said Russia would hesitate to start such a war, knowing it would mean a long, drawn out disaster.

"The old soldier, known as the 'GI's general,' talked in gentle tones of his hopes for world peace and his faith in human reason that will some day solve the world's number one problem of nations living together without a nuclear war.

Claims Misunderstanding

"I have been accused recently of being a pacifist—ever since my speech last November," he said. "I guess I was misunderstood, but I was trying to make the point that the world leaders must start right away to work out a peaceful accommodation of the conflicting forces that could lead to war."

"In that talk, in which he sought funds for a private school, Bradley warned that the space weapons and other ingenious devices being developed by science at a rapid rate are pyramiding and could lead to disaster.

"Missiles will bring anti-missiles, and anti-missiles will bring anti-anti-missiles," he said in his speech. "But inevitably this whole electronic house of cards will reach a point where it can be constructed no higher.

"At that point we shall have come to the peak of this whole incredible dilemma into which the world is shoving itself. And when that time comes there will be little we can do other than to settle down uneasily, smother our fears, and attempt to live in a thickening shadow of death."

"Bradley said he was not proposing — in his November speech—one-sided disarmament or supine submission to Russia's rocket threats. He said such appeasement would ultimately lead to war, as it did in World War II, when an op-

Standing Firm Under Pressure

Ever since his sensational speech here in Washington at St. Alban's School last Nov. 5 calling for "peaceful accommodation" instead of a missile race, which we reprinted in our issue of Nov. 18, Gen. Omar N. Bradley, has been under pressure to backtrack on sentiments so contrary to the dominant views of the State and Defense Departments. In an interview with the Chicago Tribune which that paper published on Friday, Jan. 31, Gen. Bradley said he had been accused of being a pacifist (perhaps the hardest accusation for an old soldier to bear) but nevertheless repeated his warnings. We reprint the full text of the Chicago Tribune interview as No. 1 news for all who believe in peace. It is worth noting that the President recently appointed Gen. Bradley one of a 3-man group to study reorganization of the armed forces, an index of his esteem. Reprints of the Bradley speech are still available at a penny-and-half each postpaid in orders of 100 or more.

ponent thinks he can win a quick and easy victory.

"He said this country's first task for survival and peace is to maintain its strength so that an opposing nation would not be tempted to start World War III. He declined to discuss or appraise this country's current and future military strength in relation to that of Russia.

"So long as we stay strong, Russia won't attack," he said.

When the Smaller Powers Get Nuclear Arms

"He warned that in this uncertain period of the missile race a crazed Hitler, a miscalculation of American strength or determination, an accidental explosion or a meteorite could trigger off an H-bomb war. With this 'horrible' peril hanging over the world, Bradley said, 'we can waste no time in getting started on negotiations to end the threat of war.

"He said that a 'small nation sitting on the sidelines could start something and we could be at each other's throats before we knew what happened.' In a few years, he cautioned, even small nations might have nuclear weapons and rockets in the control of 'irresponsible' leaders."

IFS Speaks Sun. Feb. 16 Community Church Boston on "Co-Existence In The Missile Age"

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed \$5:*

Name

Street

City Zone.....State.....

Enter gift sub for \$2 (6 mos.) or \$4 (1 yr.) additional:
2/10/58

(To) Name

Street

City Zone.....State.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Washington, D. C.
Post Office